



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,167	10/31/2003	Christopher A. Chaulk	EMC03-21(03115)	5467

7590 02/17/2006
Barry W. Chapin, Esq.
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER

DEBROW, JAMES J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/701,167

Applicant(s)

CHAULK ET AL.

Examiner

James J. Debrow

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 10/31/2003.
2. Claims 1-34 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 17, 31, 32, 33, and 34 are independent claims.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-14:

The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for organizing and generating report data. Specifically, the claim recites the steps of determining output criteria; parsing a set of data, applying the output criteria to compute a subset of the data; parsing the computed subset of data, and generating the ordered output. A currently recited, Claim 1 is directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result, in that the method merely manipulates data. Stated differently, the method does nothing with the processed data that produces a concrete, useful and tangible result, such as displaying the ordered output to a user or producing a hardcopy printout of the ordered output.

Dependent claims 2-14 merely recite further manipulation or specification of data. Thus, none of Claims 2-14 produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 17-30:

The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Independent claim 17 recites a data management device for organizing and generating report data comprising: a monitor operable for receiving an output criteria, a parser for parsing data, a first handler to compute a subset of the data, a second handler for generating an ordered output of the subset of data. A currently recited, Claim 17 is directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result, in that the device merely manipulates data. Stated differently, the device does nothing with the processed data that produces a concrete, useful and tangible result, such as displaying the ordered output to a user or producing a hardcopy printout of the ordered output.

Dependent claims 18-30 merely recite further manipulation or specification of data. Thus, none of Claims 18-30 produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 31-34:

The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Independent claims 31-34 correspond to independent claims 1 and 17. Thus, the claims are directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result, as indicated in the above rejections for claims 1 and 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah (Patent No.: US 6,615,253 B1; Filing Date: August 31, 1999), in view of Bates et al. (Patent No.: US 6,901,403 B1; Filing Date: Sep. 14, 2001).**

In regards to independent claim 1, Bowman-Amuah discloses *a method for organizing and generating report data indicative of a plurality of manageable entities in a managed information network comprising* (column 107, lines 23-28; column 110, lines 33-53):

***determining an output criteria applicable to a set of data to compute an ordered output display set adapted for inclusion in a report* (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);**

***parsing, in a first pass, a plurality of entries in the set of data* (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);**

Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly:

applying, during the first pass, the determined output criteria to a portion of each

parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries;

parsing, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries; and

processing, during the second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate the ordered output display set of entries.

However, Bates et al. teaches:

applying, during the first pass, the determined output criteria to a portion of each parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets);

parsing, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets);

processing, during the second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate the ordered output display set of entries (column 6 lines 52-60; Bates et al. teaches the concept of retrieving data according to criteria determined by users or applications).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to independent claim 17, Bowman-Amuah discloses a *data management device for organizing and generating report data indicative of a plurality of manageable entities in a storage area network (SAN) comprising* (column 49, lines 1-6; Fig 14; Bowman-Amuah discloses how information services manage and store electronic documents/reports within a network):

an infrastructure monitor operable for receiving an output criteria applicable to a set of data to compute an ordered output display set adapted for inclusion in a report (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);

a parser in the infrastructure monitor for parsing, in a first pass, a plurality of entries in the set of data (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);

Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly:

a first handler in the parser for applying, during the first pass, the determined output criteria to a portion of each parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries;

a second handler in the parser for parsing, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries, the parser operable to process, during the second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate the ordered output display set of entries.

However, Bates et al. teaches:

a first handler in the parser for applying, during the first pass, the determined

output criteria to a portion of each parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets);

a second handler in the parser for parsing, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries, the parser operable to process, during the second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate the ordered output display set of entries (column 6 lines 52-60; Bates et al. teaches the concept of retrieving data according to criteria determined by users or applications).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to dependent claims 2, and 18, Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly *omitting from memory, entries outside the candidate set.*

However, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, that if the parsed data was not within the desired candidate set, then it would not be stored in memory with the data that was within the desired candidate set.

In regards to dependent claims 3, and 19, Bowman-Amuah discloses *the determined output criteria includes:*

a selection criteria indicative of output records for inclusion in the candidate entries; and an arrangement criteria indicative of display formatting applicable to the candidate entries (column 109, lines 38-46).

In regards to dependent claims 4, and 20, Bowman-Amuah discloses *retaining in a memory, only the selection and arrangement criteria fields (column 113, lines 45-46; Bowman-Amuah discloses the report repository contains detailed definitions of the reports. Simply stated, detail definitions within a repository, are merely the elements/layout details of how the report is to appear, ie. selection and arrangement criteria fields within the report).*

In regards to dependent claims 5, and 21, Bowman-Amuah discloses, *selection criteria corresponds to displayable entries operable for simultaneous display on an output device (column 115, lines 10-13).*

In regards to dependent claims 6, and 22, Bowman-Amuah discloses applications use fields to collect and display data (column 36, lines 9-10).

Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly:

the arrangement criteria is indicative of ordering logic applicable to a subset of fields each of the entries based on a comparison of the fields in the entries.

However, Bates et al. teaches:

the arrangement criteria is indicative of ordering logic applicable to a subset of fields each of the entries based on a comparison of the fields in the entries (column 6, lines 2-4; Bates et al. teaches a file may be data or a *subset of data* from one or more database tables and in a particular format. Bates et al. also discloses, column 22, lines 41-45, Microsoft Excel may be used to display or print the data returned from the data source).

At the time of the invention, it had been establish, and was well know in the art that Microsoft Excel contains ordering logic that allowed the user to manipulate the data fields based on a comparison of the data fields.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to dependent claims 7, and 23, Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly *ordering logic processes at least one of the fields according to ascending or descending values.*

However, Bates et al. teaches *ordering logic processes at least one of the fields according to ascending or descending values* (column 22, lines 41-45; Bates et al. discloses, Microsoft Excel may be used to display or print the data returned from the data source).

At the time of the invention, it had been established, and was well known in the art that Microsoft Excel contains ordering logic that allowed the user to manipulate the data fields based on a comparison of the data fields. The manipulation of the data fields includes but is not limited to ordering the data fields according to ascending or descending values.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to dependent claims 8, and 24, Bowman-Amuah discloses *criteria is operable on key fields of the entries, the key fields having scalar values operable for comparison* (column 36, lines 8-17; Bowman-Amuah teaches how the fields can contain different data types, including numeric (scalar) values).

In regards to dependent claims 9, and 25, Bowman-Amuah discloses *the set of data is arranged in a predetermined data set format, the data set format operable to designate entries corresponding to rows and fields corresponding to columns* (column 279, lines 55-59; Bowman-Amuah teaches that a data within a database is stored in column and rows of a table, and the order/format of the data is known by the mapper, which contains the data retrieval mechanism).

In regards to dependent claims 10, and 26, Bowman-Amuah discloses *the predetermined data set format defines a syntax having a nested structure conversant with a parser operable to perform the first parse and the second parse, the parser further operable to extract entries and fields in each of the entries according to rows and columns* (column 279, lines 41-44).

In regards to dependent claims 11, and 27, Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly *filtering according to a filtering criteria, the filtering operable to designate a subset of entries for inclusion in the first pass and the filtering criteria operable on at least one of the field for comparison and selective inclusion in the designated subset.*

However, Bates et al. discloses *filtering according to a filtering criteria, the filtering operable to designate a subset of entries for inclusion in the first pass and the filtering criteria operable on at least one of the field for comparison and selective inclusion in the designated subset* (column 6, lines 2-4; Bates et al. teaches a file may be data or a subset of data from one or more database tables and in a particular format. Bates et al. also discloses, column 22, lines 41-45, Microsoft Excel may be used to display or print the data returned from the data source).

At the time of the invention, it had been establish, and was well know in the art that Microsoft Excel contains ordering logic that allowed the user to manipulate the data fields based on a comparison of the data fields.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a

simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to dependent claims 12, 13, 28, and 29, Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly, *callback operations operable on the data set according to predetermined logic.*

However, Bates et al. discloses *callback operations operable on the data set according to predetermined logic* (column 11, lines 54-66; Bates et al. teaches a file system interface provide callbacks corresponding to system requests and communicate the requests to the data access manager).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to dependent claims 14, and 30, Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly, *callback operations further include building the candidate set, filtering the entries in the data set, matching entries in the candidate set, sorting entries in the candidate set, and formatting entries in the candidate set.*

However, Bates et al. discloses *callback operations further include building the candidate set, filtering the entries in the data set, matching entries in the candidate set, sorting entries in the candidate set, and formatting entries in the candidate set* (column

11, lines 54-66; Bates et al. discloses a file system interface provide callbacks corresponding to system requests and communicate the requests to the data access manager, supply data to the operating system in a format conforming to the operating system, and perform other desired tasks). Using the broadest interpretation of “perform other desired tasks”, the examiner believes this to include, but not be limited to, *building the candidate set, filtering the entries in the data set, matching entries in the candidate set, sorting entries in the candidate set, and formatting entries in the candidate set.*

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to dependent claim 15, Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly, *filtering entries for omission from the candidate set and comparing key fields in entries for inclusion in the candidate set.*

However Bates et al. suggests *filtering entries for omission from the candidate set and comparing key fields in entries for inclusion in the candidate set* (column 29, lines 61-64; Bates et al. discloses, the GUI may have a field to accept column (or rows), to select an operator, and to enter a value to compare data elements in a selected column against the value according to the operator).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a mechanism in place for comparing entries to determine omission from or inclusion to the candidate set.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to dependent claim 16, Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly, *a second pass familiar comprises matching entries for inclusion in the candidate set, sorting entries in the candidate set, and formatting entries in the candidate set for display on the output device.*

However Bates et al. discloses, *a second pass familiar comprises matching entries for inclusion in the candidate set, sorting entries in the candidate set, and formatting entries in the candidate set for display on the output device* (column 29, lines 61-64; Bates et al. discloses a GUI may have a field to accept column (or rows), to select an operator, and to enter a value to compare data elements in a selected column against the value according to the operator. The GUI may also provide other desired features, such as the ability to sort data alphabetically, by number, by date, by last modification, and according to other criteria (column 29, lines 65-67). Using the broadest interpretation of Bates et al. leads the examiner to believe that other desired features would include, but not be limited to *matching entries for inclusion in the*

candidate set, and formatting entries in the candidate set for display on the output device.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to independent claim 31, Bowman-Amuah discloses a *method for efficient memory usage for organizing and generating report data indicative of a plurality of manageable entities in a storage area network (SAN)* (column 49, lines 1-6; Fig 14; Bowman-Amuah discloses how information services manage and store electronic documents/reports within a network):

determining, via a user input request, an output criteria applicable to a set of data to compute an ordered output display set adapted for inclusion in a report (column 110, lines 41-43; column 227, lines 35-39; column 229, lines 5-6);

parsing, by a build set handler, in a first pass, a plurality of entries in the set of data (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);

retrieving, during the parsing, a portion of each of the plurality of entries (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);

retrieving, by the match set handler, the entire entry corresponding to each of the portion of the entry in the candidate entries (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);

omitting from the memory, during the second pass, entries in the data set outside the output display set of entries. (At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, that if the parsed data was not within the desired candidate set, then it would not be stored in memory with the data that was within the desired candidate set).

Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly:

formatting, by a format handler, the processed complete entries to generate the output display set of entries, the output display set of entries corresponding to the determined range and ordered according to the ordering logic; and

applying, during the first pass, the determined output criteria to the retrieved portion of each parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries, the candidate entries computed by determination of a range of entries from the set of data, the range operable for inclusion in a common display screen area;

parsing, by a match set handler, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries to identify entries in the data set corresponding to the portions of entries in the candidate entries;

processing, by a sort handler, during the second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate complete entries of the entries in the candidate set;

However, Bates et al. teaches:

formatting, by a format handler, the processed complete entries to generate the output display set of entries, the output display set of entries corresponding to the determined range and ordered according to the ordering logic (column 22, lines 41-45; Bates et al. discloses, Microsoft Excel may be used to display or print the data returned from the data source).

At the time of the invention, it had been establish, and was well know in the art that Microsoft Excel contains ordering logic that allowed the user to manipulate the data fields based on a comparison of the data fields. The manipulation of the data fields includes but is not limited to determined range and ordered according to the ordering logic; and

applying, during the first pass, the determined output criteria to the retrieved portion of each parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries, the candidate entries computed by determination of a range of entries from the set of data, the range operable for inclusion in a common display screen area(column 6 lines 52-60; Bates et al. teaches the concept of retrieving data according to criteria determined by users or applications);

parsing, by a match set handler, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries to identify entries in the data set corresponding to the portions of entries in the candidate entries (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets);

processing, by a sort handler, during the second pass, the computed subset of

candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate complete entries of the entries in the candidate set (column 6 lines 52-60; Bates et al. teaches the concept of retrieving data according to criteria determined by users or applications).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to independent claim 32, Bowman-Amuah discloses a *computer program product having a computer readable medium operable to store computer program logic embodied in computer program code encoded thereon for organizing and generating report data indicative of a plurality of manageable entities in a managed information network comprising* (Bowman-Amuah discloses a computer program containing code segments, which when executed on a computer perform efficient data retrieval, the computer program being embodied on a computer readable medium. column 309, lines 48-51):

computer program code for determining an output criteria applicable to a set of data to compute an ordered output display set adapted for inclusion in a report;

computer program code for parsing, in a first pass, a plurality of entries in the set of data (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);

computer program code for processing, during the second pass, the computed

subset of candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate the ordered output display set of entries (Bowman-Amuah discloses a computer program containing code segments, which when executed on a computer perform efficient data retrieval, the computer program being embodied on a computer readable medium. column 309, lines 48-51).

Bowman-Amuah does not teach expressly:

computer program code for applying, during the first pass, the determined output criteria to a portion of each parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries;
computer program code for parsing, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries;

However, Bates et al. teaches *computer program code for applying, during the first pass, the determined output criteria to a portion of each parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries* (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets. Bates et al. also discloses a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon column 43, line 15);

computer program code for parsing, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets. Bates et al. also discloses a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon column 43, line 15);

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to independent claim 33, Bowman-Amuah discloses *a computer data signal having program code for organizing and generating report data indicative of a plurality of manageable entities in a managed information network comprising* (Bowman-Amuah discloses a computer program containing code segments, which when executed on a computer perform efficient data retrieval, the computer program being embodied on a computer readable medium. column 309, lines 48-51):

program code for determining an output criteria applicable to a set of data to compute an ordered output display set adapted for inclusion in a report (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);

program code for parsing, in a first pass, a plurality of entries in the set of data (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);

Bowman-Amuah does not disclose expressly:

program code for applying, during the first pass, the determined output criteria to a portion of each parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries;

program code for parsing, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries; and

program code for processing, during the second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate the ordered output display set of entries.

However, Bates et al. teaches:

program code for applying, during the first pass, the determined output criteria to a portion of each parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets. Bates et al. also discloses a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon column 43, line 15);

program code for parsing, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets. Bates et al. also discloses a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon column 43, line 15); and

program code for processing, during the second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate the ordered output display set of entries (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets. Bates et al. also discloses a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon column 43, line 15).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a

Art Unit: 2176

simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

In regards to independent claim 34, Bowman-Amuah *discloses a data management device for organizing and generating report data indicative of a plurality of manageable entities in a storage area network (SAN) comprising* (column 49, lines 1-6; Fig 14; Bowman-Amuah discloses how information services manage and store electronic documents/reports within a network):

means for determining an output criteria applicable to a set of data to compute an ordered output display set adapted for inclusion in a report (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);

means for parsing, in a first pass, a plurality of entries in the set of data (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);

Bowman-Amuah does not teach expressly:

means for applying, during the first pass, the determined output criteria to a portion of each parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries (column 110, lines 41-43; column 229, lines 5-6);

means for parsing, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries;
and

means for processing, during the second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate the ordered output display set of entries.

However, Bates et al. teaches:

means for applying, during the first pass, the determined output criteria to a portion of each parsed entry to compute a subset of candidate entries (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets);

means for parsing, in a second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets);

means for processing, during the second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate the ordered output display set of entries (column 6 lines 8-14; Bates et al. teaches the concept of organizing data into categories/subsets).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bates et al. with Bowman-Amuah, for the benefit of a simplified and intuitive means of accessing, presenting, manipulating, and modifying data associated with one or more data source (column 1, lines 25-28).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Hutton', with a stylized flourish at the end.

DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100